

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of

Docket No: Q78605

Akiyoshi CHOSOKABE

Appln. No.: 10/726,612

Group Art Unit: 3714

Confirmation No.: 5767

Examiner: Tramar Yong HARPER

Filed: December 4, 2003

For: GAME DEVICE, GAME CONTROL METHOD AND PROGRAM

**REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.41**

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 41.41, Appellant respectfully submits this Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer dated February 26, 2008. Entry of this Reply Brief is respectfully requested.

**Table of Contents**

STATUS OF CLAIMS .....	2
GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	4
CONCLUSION.....	5

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-14 are pending and are the basis of this Appeal.

Claim 1-14 stand rejected.

**GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

A. Whether claims 1-14 comply with the written description requirement so as to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

B. Whether the amendment to the specification filed on February 13, 2007 adds new matter to the present disclosure, and is therefore objectionable under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a).

For the purposes of this appeal, independent claims 1, 4, 5, and 6, and the claims dependent thereon, stand together.

Appellant further notes that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Iwase (5,616,079) and the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (6,280,323) in the first Office Action dated November 13, 2006 have been overcome by the arguments and amendments made in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 filed on February 13, 2007 and were not again presented in the final Office Action dated July 17, 2007. Thus, the claims are otherwise considered patentable over the prior art.

## ARGUMENT

Appellant stands by the arguments presented in the January 22, 2008 Appeal Brief.

Additionally, Appellant provides the following remarks in response to the Examiner's Answer, dated February 26, 2008.

The heart of the issue on appeal is exposed in the Examiner's allegation that “[t]he mathematical formula defines image composition rate =  $P_0 + P_1 \times \sigma_1$ . ” (Answer Brief at 7.) This is a clear misconstruction of the language of the specification which would not be made by one of ordinary skill in the art. Indeed, the entirety of the mathematical expression “ $P_0 + P_1 \times \sigma_1$ ” cannot reasonably be construed as either a rate or a ratio. It is, rather, the value “ $\sigma_1$ ” which is described as a “composition rate” in the original specification, and a “composition ratio” in the amended specification.

The original specification states the following:

[A] result of adding a pixel value  $P_0$  corresponding to a pixel having the image composition rate set among the pixel values stored in the display storage section 14, to multiplication pixel value  $P_1$  having composition rate set times image composition rate  $\sigma_1$ , that is a value of  $P_0 + P_1 \times \sigma_1$ , is set as a new pixel value.

(Original Specification at 12, 13 (emphasis added.))

Although the above-quoted language is admittedly somewhat awkward, it makes the following points abundantly clear. First, “a value of  $P_0 + P_1 \times \sigma_1$ , is set as a new pixel value.” Thus, the expression  $P_0 + P_1 \times \sigma_1$  cannot be a “rate” or “ratio” itself, but is rather an expression for calculating a new pixel value. Second, the value “ $\sigma_1$ ” is described as “image composition rate  $\sigma_1$ ,” which directly contradicts the Examiner's assertion that the entire expression “ $P_0 + P_1 \times \sigma_1$ ” should be construed as the “composition rate.”

**CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons as well as the reasons set forth in Appeal Brief, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejections of all claims on Appeal. An early and favorable decision on the merits of this Appeal is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Alan J. Kasper/*

---

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Alan J. Kasper  
Registration No. 25,426

Date: April 18, 2008